



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,863	10/01/2003	Andrew Mackenzie	B-5254 621326-1	4613
22879	7590	12/12/2007		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			KASSA, HILINA S	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION				
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/12/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/677,863	MACKENZIE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hilina S. Kassa	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 AND 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner acknowledges the amendment made to the drawing and the cancellation of claims 15 and 16. The Examiner also would like to indicate that claims 10 and 11 were rejected under Maniwa et al. (US Patent Number 5,731,879) as it is clearly stated on page 7-8 of the office action. Thus, the Examiner believes that the office action was complete.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 12-14 recite program code instructions, do not define a "computer-readable medium" and is thus non-statutory for that reason. A program code instruction can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to state, "**A computer-readable medium encoded with a program code instruction...**" in order to make the claim statutory.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 12, 17 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gardiner (US Publication Number 2004/0066523 A1).

(1) regarding claim 12:

As shown in figures 1-2, Gardiner discloses a program code instructions stored on computer readable media for controlling a print system (26, figure 1; paragraph [0023], lines 1-6; note that the control panel is used to control the imaging apparatus), said program code instructions comprising:

a component for generating user instructions (46, figure 1; paragraph [0032], lines 5-7) describing to a user of said print system an orientation for entering a set of media sheets into an input tray of a printer device for printing a print job (paragraph [0033], lines 2-15); and

a component for automatically activating printing of said user instructions *prior to completion of printing of said print job on said media sheets* (paragraph [0033], lines 10-15).

(2) regarding claim 13:

Gardiner further discloses the program code *instructions stored on computer readable media* as claimed in claim 12, configured so as to print said user instructions on a separate sheet of media which is additional to a set of media sheets used for printing of a document as a *print job* (paragraph [0033], lines 6-9; note that user instruction is generated following the first side imaging i.e. in a different set of sheet paragraph [0033], lines 13-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-11 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa et al. (US Patent Number 5,731,879) and in view of Gardiner (US Publication Number 2004/0066523 A1).

(1) regarding claim 1:

As shown in figures 1-9 Maniwa et al. disclose a method of printing double sided documents on a printer device (column 2, lines 32-39; note that images are printed on duplex surface of each form), said method comprising:

printing at least one first side of at least one media sheet in a single operation (column 11, lines 8-9; note that an image is formed on one surface of printing paper);
instructing a user to introduce said at least one media sheet into said printer device (column 11, lines 10-22; note that paper is fed from a paper feed tray by a drum);
and

printing at least one second side of said at least one media sheet (column 11, lines 22-25; note that image is printed on one surface of printing pager).

Maniwa et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for printing a set of user instructions.

However, Gardiner teaches printing a set of user instructions (paragraph [0033], lines 1-15).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a set of user instructions. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be easier to organize and to have a reliable device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

(2) regarding claim 2:

Maniwa et al. further disclose a method of printing double sided documents on a printer device (column 2, lines 32-39), said method comprising:

formatting said document into a form suitable for printing onto first sides of a plurality of media sheets in a single operation (column 5, lines 18-22; note that the print data gets converted to PDL in order to make it suitable for printing);

Maniwa et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for generating a set of user instructions for instructing a human user to manipulate said plurality of media sheets and enter said sheets into said printer.

However, Gardiner teaches generating a set of user instructions (46, figure 1; paragraph [0032], lines 5-7) for instructing a human user to manipulate said plurality of media sheets and enter said sheets into said printer (paragraph [0033], lines 2-15).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a set of user instructions for instructing a human user to manipulate said plurality of media sheets and enter said sheets into said printer. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be easier to organize and to have a reliable device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

(3) regarding claim 3:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the method as claimed in claim 2, further comprising:

formatting said document into a form suitable for printing onto a set of second sides of said plurality of media sheets (column 5, lines 18-22; note that the print data gets converted to PDL in order to make it suitable for printing even if the page is in the first side or second side); and

printing said document onto said set of second sides of said plurality of media sheets (column 11, lines 27-28).

(6) regarding claim 6:

Maniwa et al. further disclose a printing system comprising:
a computer entity capable of generating a print job (column 3, line 59-column 4, line 18);
a printer device for printing a plurality of sheets of print media according to said print job (column 12, lines 46-57);
said printing system operable for: printing first sides of a set of said print media sheets (column 12, lines 44-45); and
entering said set of printed print media sheets into said printer device for printing second sides of said media sheets (column 12, lines 58-66).

Maniwa et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for printing a set of user instructions.

However, Gardiner teaches printing a set of user instructions (paragraph [0033], lines 1-15).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a set of user instructions. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be easier to organize and to have a reliable device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

(7) regarding claim 7:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the printing system as claimed in claim 6, further operable for: printing said second sides of said plurality of print media sheets in response to a signal input by a human user (column 12, lines 58-66).

(8) regarding claim 10:

Maniwa et al. disclose a print job method comprising:
arranging a plurality of pages of information in a data format comprising a plurality of first sides and a plurality of second sides for printing at a printer device (column 11, lines 15-22; note that there are plurality of pages); and
Maniwa et al. discloses all of the subject matter as described above except for specifically teaching providing instructions to a human user in a form of information data

printed by said printer device and describing instructions to the human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into said printer device.

However, Gardiner discloses providing instructions to a human user in a form of information data printed by said printer device (paragraph [0033], lines 13-15) and describing instructions to the human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into said printer device (paragraph [0033], lines 1-15).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to provide instructions to a human user in a form of information data printed by said printer device and describing instructions to the human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into said printer device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently communicate with user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

(9) regarding claim 11:

Maniwa et al. further discloses the print job method as claimed in claim 10, further comprising pausing printing of said media sheets after a print operation of a set of said first sides of said media sheets *in response to a pause command* (column 2, lines 52-58; note that print job is stopped when the number of sheets exceed the allowable sheets stocked in tray).

(10) regarding claim 17:

Maniwa et al. further disclose a printing system operable for:
printing first sides of a set of print media sheets (column 12, lines 44-45); and
Maniwa et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for
specifically teaching printing a set of user instructions describing to a user how to enter
said set of printed print media sheets into a printer device for printing second sides of
said media sheets.

However, Gardiner discloses printing a set of user instructions describing to a
user how to enter said set of printed print media sheets into a printer device for printing
second sides of said media sheets (paragraph [0033], lines 1-5; paragraph [0034], lines
1-5).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field
of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of
ordinary skilled in the art to print a set of user instructions describing to a user how to
enter said set of printed print media sheets into a printer device for printing second
sides of said media sheets. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to
efficiently communicate with user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine
Maniwa et al. with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

(11) regarding claim 18:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the printing system as claimed in claim 17, further
operable for:

printing said second sides of said plurality of print media sheets in response to a signal activated by a human user (column 12, lines 58-66).

9. Claims 4-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa et al. (US Patent Number 5,731,879) and Gardiner (US Publication Number 2004/0066523 A1) as applied to claims 2 and 6 and further in view of Moritani (US Patent Number 6,415,115 B1)

(1) regarding claim 4:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the method as claimed in claim 2, comprising:
printing said document onto a set of second sides of said plurality of media sheets (column 11, lines 27-28); and

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for teaching to activate said printing of said second sides in response to a user command input via a user interface of said printer device.

However, Moritani teaches to activate said printing of said second sides in response to a user command input via a user interface of said printer device (column 5, lines 23-27; note that the interface controls the status of the input header).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner and Moritani are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to activate said printing of said second sides in response to a user command input via a user interface of said printer device. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. and Gardiner with Moritani to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

(2) regarding claim 5:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the method as claimed in claim 2, comprising: printing said document onto a set of second sides of said plurality of media sheets (column 11, lines 27-28); and

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for to activate printing of said set of second sides in response to an activation signal input via a user interface at a computer entity.

However, Moritani teaches to activate printing of said set of second sides in response to an activation signal input via a user interface at a computer entity (column 1, lines 29-36; note that a computer device or a terminal device is used to prepare a document with single or double-side printing pages).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner and Moritani are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to activate printing of said set of second sides in response to an activation signal input via a user interface at a computer entity. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be efficient enough for user to modify changes at user's computer terminal than the printer. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. and Gardiner with Moritani to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

(3) regarding claim 8:

Maniwa et al. further disclose the printing system as claimed in claim 6, further operable for:

printing said second sides of said plurality of print media sheets in response to a signal input by a human user (column 12, lines 58-66).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching wherein said input signal is input via a graphical user interface.

However, Moritani teaches wherein said input signal is input via a graphical user interface (column 3, lines 48-50; note that the image forming apparatus comprises an interface for transmitting/receiving an operation control signal).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner and Moritani are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art wherein said input signal is input via a graphical user interface. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be for effectively control the selections. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. and Gardiner with Moritani to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

(4) regarding claim 9:

Maniwa et al. further discloses the printing system as claimed in claim 6, further operable for:

printing said second sides of said plurality of print media sheets in response to a signal input by a human user (column 12, lines 58-66).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching wherein said input signal is received via a printer user interface positioned on said printer device.

However, Moritani discloses an image forming apparatus wherein said input signal is received via a printer user interface positioned on said printer device (column 3, lines 47-53).

Maniwa et al. and Gardiner and Moritani are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art wherein said input signal is received via a printer user interface positioned on said printer device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that it would be for effectively control the printing device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Maniwa et al. and Gardiner with Moritani to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardiner (US Publication Number 2004/0066523 A1) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Moritani (US Patent Number 6,415,115 B1).

(1) regarding claim 14:

Gardiner discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except from specifically teaching further discloses the program code instructions *stored on computer readable media* as claimed in claim 12, operable for printing said user instructions on a same media sheet as used for printing a document sent for printing.

However, Moritani discloses the program code instructions *stored on computer readable media* as claimed in claim 12, operable for printing said user instructions on a same media sheet as used for printing a document sent for printing (column 6, line 60-column 7, line 3).

Gardiner and Moritani are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to printing said user instructions on a same media sheet as used for printing a document sent for printing. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize printing resources and save extra paper. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gardiner with Moritani to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

11. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moritani (US Patent Number 6,415,115 B1) and in view of Gardiner (US Publication Number 2004/0066523 A1).

(4) regarding claim 19:

Moritani further discloses a method for printing two sided documents (column 2, lines 46-50), said method comprising:

formatting a plurality of document pages in a form suitable for printing on a plurality of sheets of print media (column 3, lines 8-15);

printing first sides of said plurality of sheet media with said document (column 5, lines 44-48);

manipulating said plurality of sheets of media in accordance with said set of printed instructions (column 5, lines 21-27);

placing said set of media sheets into an input tray of a printer device (column 5, lines 33-34); and

printing second sides of said plurality of media sheets with said document (column 5, lines 49-51).

Moritani discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching printing instructions for handling of said plurality of sheets of media.

However, Gardiner teaches printing instructions for handling of said plurality of sheets of media (paragraph [0033], lines 1-15).

Moritani and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to instructions for handling of said plurality of sheets of media. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize and save memory (paragraph [0013], lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Moritani with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

(5) regarding claim 20:

Moritani further discloses a method of sending a print job for double sided printing on a printer device (column 2, lines 46-50), said method comprising:

sending an DUPLEX ON instruction signal to said printer device (column 6, lines 40-43), indicating a duplex printing mode (column 6, lines 40-43; note that the double-side printing mode gets set); sending a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device (column 7, lines 4-8; note that printing gets performed in the fed sheets); and

sending a document file to said printer device for printing (column 6, lines 40-43; note that the print job gets printed).

Moritani discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching to send a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device.

However, Gardiner teaches sending a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device (paragraph [0033], lines 1-15).

Moritani and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to send a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so

would have been to efficiently continue the printing by notifying the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Moritani with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

(6) regarding claim 21:

Moritani further discloses a method of printing a received print job for double sided printing of a document on a printer device (column 2, lines 46-50), said method comprising:

receiving a document file at said printer device (column 1, lines 47-49), said document file comprising a set of consecutive pages (column 5, lines 38-43);

receiving a DUPLEX ON instruction signal at said printer device (column 6, lines 40-43), instructing said printer device to adopt an interrupted printing mode for printing said a document (column 3, lines 3-7; note that the sequential process is considered as the change of mode from single to double-side printing);

in response to said DUPLEX ON instruction printing a first set of pages of said document on first sides of said media sheets (column 5, lines 44-48);

receiving a user *readable* instruction instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device (column 5, lines 21-27);

printing a second set of pages of said document on second sides of said media sheets (column 5, lines 49-51), said second set of sides being alternating with said first set of sides (column 5, lines 37-43).

Moritani disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching to print user readable instructions instructing on at least one media sheet for use by a human user of the printer device.

However, Gardiner discloses printing user readable instructions instructing on at least one media sheet for use by a human user of the printer device (paragraph [0033], lines 13-15).

Moritani and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to print user readable instructions instructing on at least one media sheet for use by a human user of the printer device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently communicate with user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Moritani with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

(7) regarding claim 22:

Moritani discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the instructions printed for handing of said plurality of sheets of media are instructions printed in a human-readable form on sheet media by said printer device.

However, Gardiner discloses wherein the instructions printed for handing of said plurality of sheets of media are instructions printed in a human-readable form on sheet media by said printer device (paragraph [0033], lines 13-15).

Moritani and Gardiner are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the instructions printed for handing of said plurality of sheets of media are instructions printed in a human-readable form on sheet media by said printer device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently communicate with user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Moritani with Gardiner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb could be reached at (571) 272- 7406.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only) Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Hilina Kassa

December 5, 2007

DKM/BSB


TWYLER LAMB HASKINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER